IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO : 10487 of 2001

Between:

B.Bhaskar Reddy S/o.Bhujanga Reddy
R/o.Ramachandrapuram Village & Mandal, Medak District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Superintendent of Police,
Medak District at Sangareddy.
2 Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Ramachandrapuram, Medak District.
3 Circle Inspector, Ramachandrapuram Police Station,
Medak District.
4 B.Janardhan Reddy S/o.Tirupathi Reddy
R/o. Bhanur, Patancheru Mandal,
Medak District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ, order or direction more particularly a Writ in the nature of Mandamus under Art.226 of the Constitution of India declaring the action of the respondents in summoning the petitioner to the 3rd respondent Police station and/or confining/detaining him for hours together in the 3rd respondent Police Station and encroaching on violating his personal liberty in connection with the affairs of the defunct firm, M/s Manikanta Finance, Ramachandrapuram, Medak District or in connection with its affairs, as illegal, without authority or sanction of law, as arbitrary, and violative of Article 14 & 21 of the Constitution of India and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.M.S.R.SUBRAHMANYAM

Counsel for the Respondents: MR.M.RAJAMALLA REDDY

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

-

Alleging that the respondents are summoning to the Police Station and detaining him without there being any cognizable offence, the present writ petition is filed seeking a direction to the respondents not to summon the petitioner to the Police Station.

In the counter affidavit filed by the fourth respondent, the allegations are denied and it is stated as under.

> 3. The allegations made in paras 2 to 6 are not true and correct. I have not collected amounts under F.D.Rs, which are in the name of my sons. The petitioner has to pay the amounts under F.D.Rs. To avoid payment, the petitioner filed the above writ petition. I never brought pressure on the other respondents in this regard. I am not aware of summoning of the petitioner by the Police. There are no merits in the above writ petition. It is liable to be dismissed.

Though the counter affidavit was filed long back, no reply affidavit is filed denying the allegations. Thus, it becomes clear that the writ petition is filed on a mere surmise making imaginary allegations. The petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

The writ petition is therefore, dismissed. No costs.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO, J)

24.06.2005

vs

To

1 Superintendent of Police,
Medak District at Sangareddy.
2 Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Ramachandrapuram, Medak District.
3 Circle Inspector, Ramachandrapuram Police Station,
Medak District.
4 B.Janardhan Reddy S/o.Tirupathi Reddy
R/o. Bhanur, Patancheru Mandal,
Medak District.

5 Two CCs to the G.P for Home, High Court of A.P., Hyderabad(O.U.T).

6 2 CD copies